

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on October 16, 2001, Applicants amend the application in this Preliminary Amendment. The application is currently under appeal pursuant to a Notice of Appeal sent on February 19, 2002, and received by the Patent Office on March 5, 2002. Applicants also submit the remarks that follow.

Claims 1-82 were examined. Claims 1-82 remain in the Application.

The Patent Office rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). The Patent Office rejects claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-15, 18-28, 30-32, 35, 38-44, 48-51, 55-59, 61-63, 66, and 69-79 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The Patent Office rejects claims 7, 12-13, 16-17, 29, 33-34, 36-37, 45, 47, 52-54, 60, 64-65, 67-68 and 80-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

A. Amendments to Claims

Applicants submit amendments to independent claims 1, 22, 48 and 76. The amendments do not introduce new matter. Claims 1 and 48 are amended to recite an interconnection element comprising first and second element materials, wherein at least one of the first and second element materials comprises a material having a transformable property such that upon transformation, a geometric shape of the interconnection element is modified.

Claims 22 and 76 are amended to recite an interconnection element comprising first and second element materials, in which one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a transformable property such that upon transformation, a shape of the interconnection element is modified, wherein the one of the first element and the second element material comprises a shape memory alloy.

Claim 37 is canceled. Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office enter the amendments.

B. 35 U.S.C. §102(e): Rejection of Claims 1-6

The Patent Office rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,150,186 issued to Chen et al. (Chen). Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Chen, because Chen does not describe an interconnection element including a first element

material and a second element material, in which one of the materials comprises a material having a transformable property such that, upon transformation, a geometric shape of the interconnection element is modified. More specifically, according to one embodiment in Chen, "[t]his exothermic transformation is deduced to be the transformation that changes the microstructure and atomic configuration from that of the as-coated coating 206 to that of the heat-treated coating 210." (Chen, col. 9, lines 55-59). Chen speaks of modifying the atomic structure of coating 206, not the geometric shape of the interconnection of element.

According to the Patent Office, Chen discloses "reorganiz[ation of] the material to the new, desired form." (Final Office Action at page 7, citing Chen, Abstract, lines 10-14). However, Applicants' claim 1 recites modifying geometric shape upon transformation. Applicants once again respectfully submit that "form" is not necessarily synonymous with "geometric shape". Two items may have the same shape, but may have different forms. For example, an amorphous and a crystalline layer can have the same shape (e.g., a layer of material on a substrate), but their form (e.g., amorphous vs. crystalline) differs in various aspects. If the Patent Office persists in this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office specifically point out the manner in which Chen discloses modifying a geometric shape of an interconnection element upon transformation.

At least for the reasons stated above, Chen does not contain all of the limitations of claim 1, and, therefore, does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain all the limitations of that claim. For at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claims 2-6 are not anticipated by Chen. Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection to claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

C. 35 U.S.C. §102(b): Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-15, 18-28, 30-32, 35, 38-44, 48-51, 55-59, 61-63, 66 & 69-79

The Patent Office rejects claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-15, 18-28, 30-32, 35, 38-44, 48-51, 55-59, 61-63, 66 and 69-79 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,613,861 issued to Smith et al. (Smith). The rejected claims include independent claims 1, 22, 48 and 76. Claims 1 and 48 have been amended to recite the modification of a geometric shape of an interconnection element. Claims 22 and 76 have been amended to recite one of the first element material and the second element material in the interconnection element comprising a shape

memory alloy. As such, the arguments presented below are grouped so as to correspond to the particular claim amendments.

(i) Rejection of Claims 1 and 48, and Their Respective Dependent Claims

Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 48, as amended, are not anticipated by Smith, because Smith does not disclose an interconnection element comprising a first element material and a second element material, wherein one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a transformable property such that, upon transformation, a geometric shape of the interconnection element is modified. Applicants submit that Smith does not teach the claimed interconnection element.

Smith describes a material having a stress gradient in the multiple sub-layers of the material. The stress gradient is responsible for the form of the spring contact.

In the Final Office Action, at page 7, the Patent Office acknowledges that "[t]he stress gradient [of Smith] is not a property of a material, it is an external factor causing the shape of the modification." The Patent Office reasons that the material in Smith has a transformable property because it "may change shape", even though the changing of shape is caused by the introduction of a stress gradient. (Final Office Action, at page 7). Applicants respectfully disagree with the reasoning of the Patent Office. In general, most any item can change shape or crack if an external physical stress, such as a stress gradient or other physical force, is applied. This phenomenon is not a basis, however, to establish that all such items have a "transformable property". The transformable property of the material in an embodiment of Applicants' invention (e.g., the embodiment set forth in claim 1) is not primarily introduced by an external stress, such as physically bending the element.

Moreover, Smith fails to teach how to introduce a stress gradient. Smith merely states that "[w]hen the spring contact 15 is formed, the metal layer comprising the spring contact 15 is deposited such that compressive stress is present in upper portions of the metal layer and tensile stress is present in lower portions of the metal layer." (Smith, col. 5, lines 11-15). Applicants recognize that references are presumed to be operable. (See MPEP § 2121) However, it is well established that a prior art reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection must contain an enabling disclosure to be operative. (See MPEP § 2121.01) Furthermore, Applicants submit that Smith's stress gradient cannot be "inherent", as claimed in line 5 of the Smith Abstract, if it must be

does not claim which factor causes ability changing form

"introduced into the flat metal strip". (Smith, col. 5, lines 8-9). As such, Applicants submit that Smith is not an operative reference, and therefore cannot anticipate claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 48 are not anticipated by Smith. Claims 2-5, 8-11, 14-15 and 18-21 depend from claim 1, and, therefore, are also not anticipated by Smith at least for the reasons stated in respect of claim 1. Claims 49-51, 55-59, 61-63, 66, 69-75 depend from claim 48, and, therefore, are also not anticipated by Smith at least for the reasons stated above in respect of claim 48.

(ii) Rejection of Claims 22 and 76, and Their Respective Dependent Claims

Claims 22 and 76 were amended to recite an interconnection element comprising first and second element materials, in which one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a transformable property such that upon transformation, a shape of the interconnection element is modified, wherein the one of the first element and the second element material comprises a shape memory alloy. Applicants submit that Smith does not teach the claimed interconnection element.

Additionally, as stated in the arguments set forth above in regard to claim 1, Applicants again submit claims 22 and 76 are also not anticipated because the transformable property of the material in an embodiment of Applicants' invention (e.g., the embodiment set forth in claims 22, for example) is not primarily introduced by an external stress, such as the stress gradient of Smith.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 22 and 76 are not anticipated by Smith. Claims 23-28, 30-32, 35, 38-44 depend from claim 1, and, therefore, are also not anticipated by Smith at least for the reasons stated in respect of claim 22. Claims 77-79 depend from claim 76, and, therefore, are also not anticipated by Smith at least for the reasons stated above in respect of claim 76.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection to claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-15, 18-28, 30-32, 35, 38-44, 48-51, 55-59, 61-63, 66, and 69-79 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

D. 35 U.S.C. §103(a): Rejection of Claims 7, 12-13, 16-17, 29, 33-34, 36-37, 45, 47, 52-54, 60, 64-65, 67-68 and 80-82

The Patent Office rejects claims 7, 12-13, 16-17, 29, 33-34, 36-37, 45, 47, 52-54, 60, 64-65, 67-68 and 80-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Smith in view of various different references or in view of ordinary skill in the art. According to the Patent Office, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with such references to invent the claimed subject matter, and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to, relying on Smith, discover the quantitative characteristics relating to the claimed transformability volume and percent of spring material in the interconnection element.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and therefore contains all the limitations of that claim. Claim 7 is prima facie not obvious over Smith, because Smith fails to describe an interconnection element including a first element material and a second element material, at least one of which comprises a material having a transformable property such that, upon transformation, a geometric shape of the first element material and the second element material is modified. Further, there is no motivation from Smith to incorporate a material having a transformable property into a spring contact, as Smith accomplishes its bending through the use of a stress gradient, not material transformation.

As discussed in the pending application at pages 5-6, in order to achieve the desired shape of the body, Smith must limit the thickness of the interconnection element described therein. A limit on the thickness of the interconnection element limits the spring constant, k , of the interconnection element (k increases as thickness increases) particularly in state-of-the-art interconnection element arrays where the dimensions (e.g., length and width) of individual interconnection arrays are reduced to accommodate a corresponding increase in contact pad or terminal density. A reduction of the spring constant generally reduces the amount of load or force, F , that may be applied to resilient interconnection elements for a given deflection, x ($k=F/x$). Thus, such interconnection elements as those described in Smith generally sustain at best a moderate contact force, which may not be enough to effect reliable pressure contact to an electronic component. Therefore, in order to solve the problem of improving the resiliency of interconnection elements, particularly interconnection elements suitable for present fine-pitch electrical connections and that are scalable to future technologies, one skilled in the art would not

be motivated to consider the teachings of Smith, due to the aforementioned shortcomings of Smith.

At least for the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is not obvious. Similar to claims 1 and 7, independent claims 22, 48 and 76 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Smith, because Smith relies upon a material having a stress gradient rather than a transformable property. Accordingly, dependent claims 12-13, 16-17, 29, 33-34, 36-37, 45, 47, 52-54, 60, 64-65, 67-68 and 80-82, which depend from their respective base claims and therefore contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims, cannot be rendered obvious by Smith, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claim 7.

Moreover, claims 52-54, 60, 64-65, 67-68 depend from claim 48, and therefore contain all the limitations of claim 48, including an interconnection element comprising first and second element materials, in which one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a transformable property such that upon transformation, a shape of the interconnection element is modified, wherein the one of the first element and the second element material comprises a shape memory alloy. Applicants submit that Smith does not teach an interconnection element as claimed.

For the above stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection to claims 7, 12-13, 16-17, 29, 33-34, 36-37, 45, 47, 52-54, 60, 64-65, 67-68 and 80-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 3, 2002



William Thomas Babbitt

Reg. No. 39,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

Attachment: VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

The claims are amended as shown below.

1. (Amended) An interconnection element comprising:
 - a first element material adapted to be coupled to a substrate; and
 - a second element material coupled to the first element material, wherein one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a transformable property such that upon transformation a geometric shape of the interconnection element is modified.

22. (Amended) An electronic component comprising:
 - a substrate with a plurality of contact nodes; and
 - a plurality of free-standing resilient interconnection elements coupled to the substrate in such a manner that a base of an interconnection element electrically contacts a corresponding one of the contact nodes and an interconnection element comprises:
 - a first element material adapted to be coupled to a substrate, and
 - a second element material coupled to the first element material,
 - wherein one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a transformable property such that upon transformation, a shape of the interconnection element is modified, wherein the one of the first element and the second element material comprises a shape memory alloy.

48. (Twice Amended) An assembly comprising:
 - a first substrate having a plurality of first contact nodes formed on the first substrate and a plurality of free-standing resilient interconnection elements coupled to the first substrate in such a manner that a base of an interconnection element electrically contacts a corresponding one of the first contact nodes; and
 - a second substrate having a plurality of second contact nodes,
 - wherein the interconnection element comprises:
 - a first element material adapted to be coupled to the first substrate, and
 - a second element material coupled to the first element material, and one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a

transformable property such that upon transformation, a geometric shape of the interconnection element is modified,

wherein the interconnection element has a portion thereof which is capable of moving to a first position in which the interconnection element is in contact with one of the plurality of second contact nodes.

76. (Twice Amended) A system for contacting an electronic device including an assembly comprising:

a first substrate having a plurality of first contact nodes formed on the first substrate and a plurality of free-standing resilient interconnection elements coupled to the first substrate in such a manner that a base of an interconnection element electrically contacts a corresponding one of the first contact nodes; and

a second substrate having a plurality of second contact nodes,

wherein the interconnection element comprises:

a first element material adapted to be coupled to the first substrate, and

a second element material coupled to the first element material, and one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a material having a transformable property such that upon transformation, a shape of the interconnection element is modified, wherein the one of the first element material and the second element material comprises a shape memory alloy, and

wherein the interconnection element has a portion thereof which is capable of moving to a first position in which the interconnection element is in contact with one of the plurality of second contact nodes.